

## REMARKS

The Drawings have been objected to as failing to show pivotally mounting the gear box on the frame and the gear box and drive shaft adapted to be pivoted between inoperable and operable positions. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection and submits that this feature is shown in Fig 6 as filed. Upon review of the specification and drawings applicant has noted a minor error in the depiction of Fig 6 and respectfully requests permission to amend Fig 6 as submitted herewith and from which it is believed somewhat clearer how tube 47 is rotatably mounted within fixed tubular housing 31 so as to permit the gear box 32 to pivot on the frame so that the drive shaft can be moved up and down. Applicant wishes to express his appreciation to the Examiner for drawing the drawing discrepancy to his attention. It further appears that Fig 6 has been drawn on an insufficient scale to clearly illustrate the precise working of the mechanism, and accordingly applicant respectfully requests permission to introduce new Figures 9-11 to more clearly illustrate original Fig. 6. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been introduced in as much as Figure 9 is merely the right hand end of Figure 6 redrawn to a much larger scale. Figure 10 is merely Figure 9 with the shaft 30 and housing 31 separated from each other for clarity. Figure 11 is merely a section through Figure 9 and readily inferable from the specification as originally filed. Figure 8 has been amended to provide a revised reference numeral so as to avoid an unintentional duplication of numbers. Claim 13 has been amended to correct the spelling error noted by the Examiner. As discussed hereinbelow, Claim 5 to which the Examiner objected has been


incorporated into claim 1 which has been amended to incorporate the suggested amendment for claim 5.

Applicant notes, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5-11, and in order to expedite prosecution of this application has incorporated the limitations of claims 4 and 5 into claim 1 with the consequent cancellation of claims 4 and 5 and amendment of the dependency of claim 14. Thus it is believed that all of the claims remaining in this application are now in condition for allowance.

By this amendment it is believed that the rejections under 35USC103 have been rendered moot and that extensive discussion of the references relied upon by the Examiner is unnecessary. In passing, however, applicant respectfully submits that none of the references relied upon by the Examiner is remotely similar to applicant's invention, taken alone or in combination. In all cases the propulsion device is mounted over the transom or stern of the watercraft, whereas applicant's device is mounted over the gunwhale of the watercraft. By definition, and contrary to the Examiner's suggestion, the transom refers to the **stern** of the vessel and the gunwhale refers to the **side** of the vessel. As noted on pages 1 (lines 18-22) and page 6 (lines 1-2), it is almost a physical impossibility for a canoeist in a long, narrow and relatively unstable canoe to reach behind himself to raise a propulsion device affixed to the **stern** of his canoe, whereas it is a simple matter to reach over the **side** of the canoe to grasp the drive shaft and raise or lower it.

In view of the above amendments and discussion and the limitation of the present claims to the indicated allowable subject matter, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

 8/20/04

Ralph A. Dowell, Reg. No 26,868

Dowell & Dowell, P.C.  
Suite 309, 1215 Jefferson Davis Hwy.  
Arlington, VA, 22202-3124  
Telephone: 703-415-2555  
Fax: 703-415-2559  
e-mail: dowell@dowellpc.com